In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.29345-M of 2007

.....

Date of decision:10.5.2007

Harpreet Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

....

Present: Mr. Balbir Singh Sewak, Advocate for the petitioners.

.....

S.S. Saron, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala may be impleaded as a party as respondent No.1-A.

The request of the petitioner is allowed and Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala is impleaded as respondent No.1-A. The Registry to carry out necessary corrections in the memo parties.

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking directions to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners as they are facing threats from respondents No.3 and 4, who are the mother and brother respectively of petitioner No.1. It is submitted that both the petitioners are major and being eligible to marry, they have solemnized their marriage amongst themselves on 28.4.2007 at Gurdwara Gurshabad Parkash, Akal Ashram, Sohana. Photographs showing the solemnization of marriage by way of Anand Karaj ceremony are placed on record as Annexure-P.4.

However, the marriage that has been solemnized is not to the liking of the mother and brother of petitioner No.1 and they are holding out threats to the petitioners and are likely to involve them in some criminal case. On 6.5.2007, when the petitioners visited Patiala, the SHO Police Station Sadar Patiala (respondent No.2) stopped the petitioners with the help of his companion police officials and threatened them. On the same day i.e. 6.5.2007 the petitioners submitted an application (Annexure-P.5) to the SSP, Patiala (respondent No.1-A) for protecting their life and liberty. However, till date the Police has not taken any action. Rather, the Police had raided the house of the petitioners at Kurali on 6.5.2007 in the evening. The petitioners, therefore, pray for protecting their life and liberty

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and perusing the record, in my view, the SSP, Patiala (respondent No.1-A) would be in a better position to ascertain the ground realities and also grant protection to the petitioners as has been prayed for in the present petition.

In the circumstances, this criminal miscellaneous petition is disposed of with a direction to SSP, Patiala (respondent No.1-A) that in case the petitioners approach him setting out their grievances as have been made in the present petition, the same would be looked into by him independently and in accordance with law.

May 10, 2007. **(S.S. Saron)**
Judge

hsp